

Remarks

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 1 - 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a) for being based on inadequate disclosure. Claims 4 - 5 have been cancelled thereby obviating the Examiner's rejection of these claims under this Section.

The Examiner indicates that the disclosure is inadequate as to structurally how the system knows when to operate switches 27, 37 to timely divert the selected rollers 8a, 8b of the selected wagon. Furthermore, the Examiner indicates how does the switch 37,37' know when there is an opening to supply a wagon into?

As the Applicant indicated in the Response and Amendment dated August 17, 2000, in the Specification, the workstation wagons are used in a manufacturing environment to facilitate the production of a known series of processing steps. Since these steps are repeated, the position of switch 37, which is the points tongues that controls the removal/insertion of wagons, can be programmed. Their position can also be manually operated as necessary to adjust the manufacturing sequence. Other structural details and operations are known to those ordinarily skilled in the art.

The Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would know that detection of the empty space and starting the friction drive for the wagon to be inserted can be easily made by suitable control means or by a man viewing the empty space and starting the wagon to be inserted at a moment that the wagon meets the empty space.

Since the wagons are work-station wagons, the work is performed in the wagons, while the wagons move around the track. Accordingly, the wagons move extremely slow. Furthermore, the space for insertion is extremely large due to the curve of the track (if wagon IV in Fig. 2 is missing, wagon X may be inserted behind wagon V). As a result, switching may be easily made by hand.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 – 3 and 6 overcome the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection.

II. Drawing Objections under 37CFR 1.83(a)

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The Examiner indicates that the load-dependent drive of Claim 4 must be shown or the feature(s) cancelled from the claim(s). Since Claim 4 has been deleted, the Examiner's objections to the Drawings are rendered moot.

For any and all of the aforementioned reasons, reconsideration and early allowance of Claims 1 - 3 and 6 is courteously requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BERND WILLING

By

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Noland J. Cheung', written over a horizontal line.

Noland J. Cheung
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 39,138

Bayer Corporation
100 Bayer Road
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15205-9741
(412) 777-2827
FACSIMILE PHONE NUMBER:
(412) 777-5449
/vjt/NJC3080